18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 2 3 4 5	Marquis & Aurbach Albert G. Marquis, Esq. Nevada State Bar No. 1919 Craig R. Anderson, Esq. Nevada State Bar No. 6882 10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 (702) 382-0711 Attorneys for Defendants			FILEDRECEIVEDENTEREDSERVED ON COUNSELY MATIES OF RECORD  2003 APR -8 A 10: 48  ULCRY US DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA  BYDEPUTY
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA			
10	DONALD HINTON, DAV	ID HINTON and	Case No.	CV-S-03-0057-PMP-PAL
11	JOHN REYES,			
12		Plaintiffs,		
13	VS.			
14	CLARK COUNTY, NEVA			
15	subdivision, acting by and to VEGAS METROPOLITAN	N POLICE		
16	DEPARTMENT; JOHN D	UES 1-30 and		
10	ROE ENTITIES 1-10,			

### **DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT**

Defendants, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department ("LVMPD") and Clark County, Nevada, by and through their attorneys of record, Marquis & Aurbach, hereby answer and allege as follows:

- 1. In answering paragraphs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 18, 19, 21, 22, 26, 27, 31, 36, 41, and 47, the Answering Defendants are without sufficient knowledge to form an opinion as to the truth of the allegations contained therein, and therefore deny the same.
- 2. In answering paragraphs 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52, the Answering Defendants deny the allegations contained therein.

1	3. In answering paragraph 3, the Answering Defendants admit the allegation		
2	contained therein.		
3	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES		
4	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
5	Plaintiffs' suit fails to state a claim for relief as they failed to allege a violation of a right,		
6	privilege, or immunity secured by the United States Constitution or by the laws of the United States.		
7	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
8	Plaintiffs' suit fails to state a claim for relief as there was adequate administrative and state		
9	remedy which Plaintiffs could have pursued.		
10	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
11	Answering Defendants did not enact or promulgate any policy, statute, ordinance or custom,		
12	policy or procedure which denied or abridged any of the Plaintiffs' constitutional rights.		
13	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
14	The damage sustained by the Plaintiffs, if any, was caused by the acts of third persons who		
15	were not agents, servants, or employees of the answering Defendants, and who were not acting on		
16	behalf of the Answering Defendants in any manner or form, and, as such, the Defendants are not liable		
17	in any manner to the Plaintiffs.		
18	FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
19	The complained of acts of the Answering Defendants were justified and privileged under the		
20	circumstances.		
21	SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
22	At all times mentioned in Plaintiffs' Complaint, the answering Defendants acted in good faith		
23	belief that their actions were legally justifiable.		
24	SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
25	The Answering Defendants are qualifiedly immune from the actions alleged against them in		
26	Plaintiffs' Complaint.		
27	EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
28	That Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 41 limits the damages that may be collectible against		
	$\boldsymbol{o}$		

27

28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

a political subdivision of the State of Nevada to FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$50,000).

#### NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Answering Defendants are not subject to suit upon which the facts and conclusions as stated in Plaintiffs' Complaint by reason of their sovereign immunity as a political subdivision of the State of Nevada, and more particularly by reason of the provisions of NRS 41.031, 41.032, and 41.033.

#### TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' Complaint concerns a discretionary function of the Answering Defendants for which the Answering Defendants are immune.

#### ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Plaintiffs' claims of constitutional violation is unsupported in both fact and law, as Plaintiffs have not alleged sufficient basis from which a constitutional interest might arise in conjunction with the alleged actions.

#### TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent Plaintiffs' causes of actions against Answering Defendants sound in negligence, no recovery can be predicated upon 42 USCA §1983.

# THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Any injuries allegedly sustained by Plaintiffs were the result of their own negligence and/or actions.

### FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

#### FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution.

# SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs cannot recover punitive or exemplary damages because Plaintiffs have failed to plead and cannot establish facts sufficient to support allegations of malice, oppression or fraud. Plaintiffs are not entitled to recover punitive or exemplary damages herein under any of the claims of relief alleged as none of the Defendants' supervisors, directors or managing agents committed the alleged

1	malicious,
2	knowledge
3	such perso
4	
5	Th
6	particulari
7	
8	De
9	the condu
10	
11	De
12	new infor
13	∥ w
14	
15	same be o
16	
17	defense o
18	
19	premises.
20	
21	
22	<b>1</b>
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

malicious, fraudulent or oppressive acts, authorized to ratify such wrongful conduct or had advanced knowledge of the unfitness of any employee(s) who allegedly committed the acts and did not employ such person(s) with conscience disregard for the higher safety of others.

# SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The claims, and each of them are barred by Plaintiffs' failure to plead those claims with particularity.

# EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendant LVMPD has not been negligent and has not breached its duty to properly supervise the conduct of its employees with whom Plaintiffs interacted.

# NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Defendants reserve the right to amend these Affirmative Defenses as discovery unfolds and new information is discovered.

WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows:

- 1. That Plaintiffs take nothing by virtue of their complaint on file herein, that the same be dismissed with prejudice;
- 2. For an award of reasonable attorneys fees and costs of suit incurred in the defense of this action; and
- 3. For such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper in the premises.

MARQUIS & AURBACH

Crang R. Anderson, Esq. Nevada State Bar No. 6882

10001 Park Run Drive Las Vegas, Nevada 89145

# **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING** I hereby certify that on the \_\_\_\_\_\_ day of April, 2003, I served a copy of the foregoing ANSWER upon each of the parties by depositing a copy of the same in a sealed envelope in the United States Mail, Las Vegas, Nevada, First-Class Postage fully prepaid, and addressed to: Bradley Booke, Esq. 6000 S. Eastern Ave., #14A Las Vegas, Nevada 89119 Edward Moriarity, Esq. 15 Jackson Street Box 548 Jackson, Wyoming 83001 and that there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the place(s) so addressed.